UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,635	10/30/2001	Mark J. Finocchio	MSFT116732	4418

26389 7590 09/22/2005

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
KENDALL, CHUCK O	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2192	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/001,635	FINOCCHIO, MARK J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chuck O. Kendall	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. This action is in response to the application filed 06/27/05.

2. Claims 1 – 38 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9,11, 12, 14 – 19, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 34, 36 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Althoff et al. USPN 6,374,252 B1 in view of Inoue USPN 5,784,037.

Regarding Claims 1 & 29, Althoff discloses a method for processing object property changes;

the method comprising:

obtaining a request to process at least one object property change, the request corresponding to a software application object (7:10 – 15);

initiating a property change defer cycle (21: 12 – 21, as interpreted see transaction begin and end for all changes (multiple changes or batch, also see lines 22 – 27, for specifying order of execution).

processing the at least one object property change (21: 12 – 21, see change to database model also see 7: 53 – 55, which defines the database model as comprising editable objects);

determining the end of the property change defer cycle (21: 12 – 21, , see transaction end);

implementing the processed at least one object property change upon the determination of the end of the property change defer cycle (21:18 – 21, see operations being committed to when transaction end is invoked].

Althoff, doesn't explicitly disclose processing display object property changes. However, Inoue in an analogous art does disclose requesting and processing property changes for a display object (7:55 – 65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Althoff and Inoue because, enabling display property changes would make the display more customizable.

Regarding Claims 2 & 30, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request to process at least one display object property change is transmitted by the software application (Inoue, 7:55 – 65).

Regarding Claims 3 & 31, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request to process at least one display object property change includes obtaining;

a request to process multiple property changes (Inoue,7:55 – 65).

Regarding Claims 5 & 21, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein processing the at least one display object property change includes associating a property change group category (Inoue, 7:50 – 65, shows a particular mode which Examiner interprets to affect a group or multiple items) to the at least one object display property change (Althoff, FIG. 4, 411,and for display property change see Inoue 7:55 – 65).

Regarding Claims 6 & 22, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein processing the at least one display object property change includes generating a property change group memory array, the property change group memory array including array elements corresponding to an object associated with the property change request (Althoff, 28:7 – 10, " when large numbers of rows are to be

selected from a table (for example a group), the system attempts to fetch those rows into an array, for faster retrieval").

Regarding Claim 7, the method as recited in Claim 6, wherein processing the at least one display object property change includes populating the property change group memory array with the property change group category associated with the at least one object property change (Althoff, 28:7 – 10, see array fetching, for display see Inoue 7:50 - 65).

Regarding Claim 8, the method as recited in Claim 6, wherein processing the at least one display object property change includes populating the property change group memory array with every object property change obtained in the property change request (Althoff, 28:7 – 11, for display refer to Inoue, 7:55 – 65).

Regarding Claim 9, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein processing the at least display one object property change includes identifying additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the property changes obtained in the property change request (Althoff, 26: 1 – 5, for display refer to Inoue, 7:55 – 65).

Regarding claim 11, the method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising prior to determining the end of the property change defer cycle:

determining whether additional software application work is required;

if additional software application work is required, initiating a second property change defer cycle (Althoff, 26: 1 – 5);

processing any additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the additional software application work; and determining the end of the second property change defer cycle (Althoff, 26: 1 – 5).

Regarding Claims 12 & 34, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein determining the end of the property change defer cycle includes obtaining a request from the software application to terminate the property change defer cycle (Althoff, 21:13 – 15).

Regarding Claims 14 & 36, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request to process at least one object property change includes a request to

process at least one software application user interface object (Althoff, 20:30 – 35, see graphics object).

Regarding Claim 15, the computer-readable version of Claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 16, the system version of Claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 17, the system version of Claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 18, the method as recited in Claim 17, wherein the request to process at least one object property change corresponding to a display object includes obtaining a request to process multiple property changes corresponding to a display object (20:30 – 35, see graphics object, also see 21: 12 – 20, for atomic transactions).

Regarding claim 19, the method as recited in Claim 17, wherein the request to process at least one object property change corresponding to a display object includes obtaining a request to process multiple property changes corresponding to multiple display objects (21: 12 – 20, for atomic transactions and all changes to user database model).

Regarding Claim 23, which recites similarly as previously discussed Claim 11 see rationale above.

Regarding Claim 24, which recites similarly as previously discussed Claim 12 see rationale above.

Regarding Claim 26, which recites similarly as previously discussed Claim 18 see rationale above.

Regarding Claim 27, the computer readable version of Claim 17, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 28, the system version of Claim 17, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 37, the computer readable version of Claim 29, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 38, the system version of Claim 29, see rationale above as previously discussed.

5. Claim 4,10,13,20,25,32,33, & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Althoff et al. USPN 6,374,252 B1 (hereinafter "Althoff") as applied in claims 1, 17 and 29, in view Inoue USPN 5,784,037 and further in view of Shetyn USPN 6,499,062 (hereinafter "Shetyn").

Regarding Claims 4, 20 & 32, Althoff as modified discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claims 1, 17 & 29. Although, Althoff does disclose an atomic transaction which includes a begin and end transaction for collecting and performing all changes, which Examiner has interpreted to be equivalent to Applicant's defer cycle limitation. The combination of Althoff and Inoue doesn't explicitly disclose wherein initiating the display property change defer cycle includes incrementing a property change defer cycle counter. However, Shetyn in an analogous art does teach in 8:50 – 60 delay objects (defer cycle), which are used to start counting and calculate delay object changes. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shetyn's teachings off delay objects (defer cycle) and as well as counting using timers with Althoff and Inoue, because, " it enables the user to create a macro" (Shetyn, 8:58 - 62) and macro's typical shorten the program and improve time and programming over head.

Regarding Claims 10 & 33, Shetyn further discloses the method as recited in Claim 9 further comprising, prior to determining the end of the property change defer cycle:

initiating a second property change defer cycle (Shetyn, 8:50 – 55, see third route);

processing any additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the property changes obtained in the property change request (Shetyn, 8:50 – 55); and

determining the end of the second property change defer cycle (Shetyn, 8:52 – 58).

Regarding Claims 13, 25 & 35, Althoff as modified discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claims 1, 17 and 29. Although, Althoff does disclose an atomic transaction which includes a begin and end transaction for collecting and performing all changes, which Examiner has interpreted to be equivalent to Applicant's defer cycle limitation. The combination of Althoff and Inoue doesn't explicitly disclose wherein determining the end of the property change defer cycle includes the expiration of a defined time period. However, Shetyn in an analogous art does teach in 8:52 – 55 delay objects (defer cycle), which are used to start counting and calculate delay object changes (see time specified in delay object). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shetyn's teachings of counting and calculating delay object changes including the time which is specified within the delay object with Althoff and Inoue, because, " it enables the user to create a macro" (Shetyn, 8:58 - 62) and macro's typical shorten the program and improve time and programming over head.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-2723698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-2723695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CK

TED T. VO
Primary Examiner